

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that claims 1 and 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because these claims can be implemented by hand without a computer. The Examiner requested that the term "Ethernet" be capitalized and accompanied by generic terminology throughout the specification. The Examiner asserted that the Declaration was defective. Claims 1-10, 12, and 20-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by USP No. 6,477,437 to Yo Hirota (hereinafter referred to as "Hirota"). Claims 13-19 were allowed. Claims 11 and 30 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 20 to clarify the subject matter recited therein. Claims 13 and 15 have been amended to correct minor errors. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-30 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

I. Objections to the Declaration

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the Declaration is defective because the Declaration does not identify the mailing address of each inventor. Applicants respectfully disagree. This information is included for each of the inventors adjacent to the two lines preceded by the language "Residence" and "Post Office Address" on the Declarations. For the Examiner's convenience, a copy of the Declaration is attached to this response. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the Declaration.

II. The Term "Ethernet" in the Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the trademark "Ethernet" should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by generic terminology. Applicants have reviewed the application to confirm that the term Ethernet is capitalized throughout. In addition,

Applicants have reviewed the application and confirmed that “Ethernet” is described as one technology for implementing the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s concerns have been addressed.

III. Allowable Claims and Objections to Claims 11 and 30

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 13-19 and for indicating that claims 11 and 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Because the proper form for presenting claims 11 and 30 may depend at least upon the allowability of claims 1 and 20, Applicants will present these claims in form for allowability after continuing to pursue the allowability of claims 1 and 20.

IV. Amendments to Claims 1, 13, 15, and 20

Claims 1 and 20 have each been amended to clarify that the customer and the manufacturer are different entities. Claim 13 and 15 have been amended to correct minor errors. Specifically, the “manufacturer” limitation of claim 13 has been amended to insert the word “to” before the phrase “said group of components”. In claim 15, the word “base” has been inserted after the word “knowledge” to ensure the consistent use of the term “knowledge base” throughout the claim. Claim 15 has also been amended to insert the word “instructions” after the word “assembly” to ensure the consistent use of the term “assembly instructions” throughout the claim.

V. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as reciting an abstract idea with practical application in the technological art. The Examiner asserted that the recited steps can be performed by hand without being implemented on a computer. Applicants have amended the preamble of claim 1 to specify that the recited steps are

intended to be implemented utilizing a computer. Because each of claims 3-8 are dependent either directly or indirectly upon independent claim 1, this amendment to claim 1 also addresses the Examiner's concerns with respect to claims 3-8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection.

VI. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the office action dated December 3, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 12 and 20-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Hirota. Applicants respectfully submit that Hirota does not anticipate any of claims 1-10, 12 and 20-29 for at least the following reasons.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, "every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference." In re Bond, 910 F. 2d 831, 832, 15 USPQ 2d 1566, 1567 (Fed Cir. 1990) (emphasis added).

A. Claims 1-10 and 12

Applicants respectfully submit that Hirota does not identically describe every element of claim 1 because Hirota does not describe steps of sending a customer request and presenting a set of assembly instructions "wherein said customer and said manufacturer are different entities" as recited in amended claim 1. One embodiment of Hirota describes an assembly work support system wherein the system receives a request from an operator and then sends out assembly messages in response to the request. Abstract and Col. 14, lines 15-20. The operator may be an assembly line worker who utilizes the system to request and receive information on how to perform tasks within his/her workplace. Col. 1, lines 13-25. Hirota claims to improve upon the prior art by providing assembly messages in the form of moving or still pictures rather than written training instructions which must be read by the operator. Col. 2, lines 42-50. Hirota contemplates that the operator would utilize the described system at his/her workplace. Thus, the operator and the owner of the system would all be part of the same entity. In contrast to Hirota,

claim 1 recites sending a customer request for assembly instructions to a manufacturer and then presenting assembly instructions to assemblers wherein the customer and the manufacturer are different entities. Because nothing in Hirota describes the operator and the system owner as being different entities, Hirota does not identically describe every element of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Hirota does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Hirota.

Each of claims 2-10 and 12 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-10 and 12 are patentable over Hirota for the same reasons that independent claim 1 is patentable over Hirota.

B. Claims 20-29

Claim 20 recites a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon which are identical to the limitations recited in claim 1. As with claim 1, claim 20 has been amended to emphasize that the customer and the manufacturer are different entities. Thus, for the same reasons as those described above with respect to claim 1, Hirota does not identically describe each limitation of claim 20 and therefore does not anticipate the subject matter recited in claim 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Hirota.

Each of claims 19-29 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon independent claim 20. Therefore, claims 19-29 are patentable over Hirota for the same reasons that independent claim 20 is patentable over Hirota.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 3-3-04

Earl D. Brown, Jr.

Earl D. Brown, Jr.

Reg. No. 44,042

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
PO Box 51860
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext.103
Fax: (650) 752-0995